



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,703	10/24/2003	Joseph M. Koenig JR.	TRI4546P0161US	9791
32116	7590	04/26/2007	EXAMINER	
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661			RACHUBA, MAURINA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/26/2007		PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/692,703	KOENIG, JOSEPH M.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Maurina Rachuba	3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 02 March 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new rejection set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:



Joseph Hail

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3723

3. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kingman, 2,386,900. '900 discloses a sanding block conforming, when viewed macroscopically before the sanding block becomes worn, substantially to a block having two expansive sides **11, 13** and two adjacent sides **14, 12**, wherein a given one of the expansive sides is abrasive (column 2, lines 46-52, wherein the given one of the expansive sides has two opposite edges, at each of which one of the adjacent sides adjoins the given one of the expansive sides, wherein a given one between **11** and **14**, of the opposite edges, when viewed macroscopically before the sanding block becomes worn, is a sharp edge, see column 2, lines 10-13, and wherein the other one of the opposite edges, at **17**, when viewed macroscopically before the sanding block becomes worn, is a curved edge. Note that both expansive and both adjacent sides have abrasive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingman, '900. '900 does not explicitly disclose that the curved edge defines a radius not less than about 1/8 inch at any location on the curved edge. '900 does disclose that the edge is curved. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have made the curved edge of whatever size of curvature desired, since such a modification would

have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Here, '900 teaches, column 4, lines 9-18, that the curved portions of the tool may be made to fit the curved portions of the work piece. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have provided '900 with the claimed radius of curvature, dependent on the shape of the work piece being sanded.

6. Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingman '900 in view of Hayes, 2,553,254. '900 does not disclose the sharp edge defined by an acute angle in the range from about 55 to 70 degrees. '254, in a similar abrasive tool, teaches providing a sanding block conforming, when viewed macroscopically before the sanding block becomes worn, substantially to a block having two expansive sides, top and bottom **3**, and two adjacent sides, left and right, **2**, wherein a given one of the expansive sides is abrasive, wherein the given one of the expansive sides has two opposite edges, at each of which one of the adjacent sides adjoins the given one of the expansive sides. "254 does not explicitly disclose that the edges are sharp or curved, but does clearly show in the drawings that the angle between one of the expansive and adjacent surfaces is between from about 55 to 70 degrees. MPEP 2125 states: Drawings and pictures can anticipate claims if they clearly show the structure which is claimed. *In re Mraz*, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (CCPA 1972). Here, '254 clearly discloses that the acute angle (measured from a vertical line extending from the edge) formed by the expansive and adjacent sides is between about 55 to 70 degrees. If applicant argues that '254 does not disclose the claimed range, it is

the examiner's position that '254 does at the least, teach that the angle between the expansive and adjacent sides be less than 90 degrees, and that the size of the angle, as long as it is less than 90 degrees, is not critical to applicant's invention, as the size of the angle would depend on the shape of the work piece being sanded. '900 discloses that the adjacent sides adjoining the expansive sides are also abrasive.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues that Hays does not disclose a sharp edge when viewed macroscopically before the edge becomes worn. The examiner disagrees. As the sharpness of the edge has been defined as visually determined, and not by a defined and measurable radius of curvature, the edge as shown by Hays can be considered as a sharp edge. Applicant has defined his sharp edge as the result of an acute angle between the expansive and adjacent sides. It is noted that applicant has not disclosed a radius of curvature for the sharp edge, only that it looks sharp. By applicant's criteria, the edge disclosed by Hays is a sharp edge.

8. It is noted that the Appeal Brief was filed 02 March 2006. Due to Office error, the appeal was not timely considered. Any inconvenience to applicant is sincerely regretted.

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurina Rachuba whose telephone number is 571 272 4493. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571 272 4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Maurina Rachuba  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3723

AK 4/10/07